arXiv:1702.01940v2 [quant-ph] 23 Feb 2017

One shot entanglement assisted classical and quantum communication over noisy quantum channels: A hypothesis testing and convex split approach

Anurag Anshu* Rahul Jain† Naqueeb Ahmad Warsi‡

February 24, 2017

Abstract

In this work we study several communication tasks over noisy quantum channels and provide bounds on the amount of reliable communication between senders and receivers. Our results are in the one-shot setting with the extra resource of quantum entanglement between senders and receivers. We show 1) tight bounds on the amount of reliable communication for the *point-to-point channel*, 2) an achievability bound for point-to-point channel with quantum side information about the channel at the encoder (quantum analogue of the *Gel'fand-Pinsker* channel), 3) an achievability bound for point-to-point channel with limited quantum side information about the channel at the encoder, 4) an achievability bound for the *broadcast-channel*, a quantum analogue of the *Marton inner bound*.

We take a unified approach to arrive at all our results, primarily using *hypothesis testing and convex split*. The forms of our results match with that of the corresponding results for similar communication tasks over noisy classical channels. To obtain the quantum analogue of Marton inner bound we prove a (bi-partite) generalization of the convex-split lemma, which may be of independent interest.

1 Introduction

Understanding the classical and quantum capacities of a quantum channel is a fundamental information theoretic question which is very well studied. Optimal bounds on achievable rates are known for several tasks in the asymptotic model [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Recent works [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] have explored the one-shot model. We consider the model in which the sender Alice and receiver Bob share entanglement between them. In this setting, it is well known using teleportation and super-dense coding that, the classical capacity of any channel is exactly twice its quantum capacity (see e.g. [6]). This is also the case for all the tasks we consider and hence we focus on the classical capacity. We study the following communication tasks (please refer to Section 2 for definitions of the information theoretic quantities involved in our results below).

*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore. a0109169@u.nus.edu

†Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore and MajuLab, UMI 3654, Singapore. rahul@comp.nus.edu.sg

‡Centre for Quantum Technologies and SPMS, NTU, Singapore and IIITD, Delhi. warsi.naqueeb@gmail.com

Task 1: Alice wants to communicate a classical message M chosen from $[1 : 2^R]$ to Bob over a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}$ such that Bob is able to decode the correct message with probability at least $1-\varepsilon^2$. It is known [15] that the optimal communication R^* is at most

$$\max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'}} \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_{AA'})\|\mathcal{N}(\psi_A)\otimes\psi_{A'})\,.$$

We show that it is possible to achieve this rate within additive $O(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. We also provide a new proof for this upper bound on R^* again up to additive $O(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$.

We recover [9] the following achievability bound (up to additive $O(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$) for the same task, but without shared entanglement:

$$\max_{\psi_{AA'}} \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_{AA'})\|\mathcal{N}(\psi_A)\otimes\psi_{A'})\,,$$

where $\psi_{AA'}$ is a classical-quantum state with register A' being classical. A matching converse bound has been given in [9].

Task 2: Alice wants to communicate a classical message M chosen from $[1 : 2^R]$ to Bob over a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ such that Bob is able to decode the correct message with probability at least $1-\varepsilon^2$. Alice shares entanglement $|\phi\rangle_{SS'}$ with the channel as well. This model in the classical setting is called as the *Gel'fand-Pinsker* channel [16]. We show the following communication is achievable (within additive $O(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$):

$$\max_{\psi_{AA'S}:\psi_S=\phi_S} \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AA'S})\|\mathcal{N}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'}) - \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\psi_{A'S}\|\psi_{A'}\otimes\psi_S)\,.$$

Task 3: Alice wants to communicate a classical message M chosen from $[1 : 2^R]$ to Bob over a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ such that Bob is able to decode the correct message with probability at least $1-\varepsilon^2$. To accomplish this task, Charlie aids Alice by sending a variation of his share S' of entanglement $|\phi\rangle_{SS'}$ that he shares with the channel. This problem in the classical setting was studied in [17]. We show that the following communication pair (R_1, R_2), where R_1 is the communication from Alice to Bob and R_2 is the communication from Charlie to Alice, is achievable (within additive $O(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$):

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AA'S})\|\mathcal{N}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'}) - \tilde{\mathrm{I}}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(A' : CS)_{\psi},\\ R_2 &\geq \tilde{\mathrm{I}}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(S : T)_{\phi}, \end{aligned}$$

where the register T is sent by Charlie to Alice and C is his remainder register. The information theoretic quantities above are calculated with respect to the state $\psi_{AA'CS}$ which satisfies $\psi_{CS} = \phi_{CS}$.

Task 4: Alice wants to communicate a classical message pair (M_1, M_2) chosen from $[1 : 2^{R_1}]\times[1 : 2^{R_2}]$, where the message M_1 is intended for Bob and M_2 is intended for Charlie, over a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}$. We show that any pair (R_1, R_2), where R_1 is the communication from Alice to Bob and R_2 is the communication from Alice to Charlie, satisfying the following is achievable(within additive $O(\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$):

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1})\|\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_1})\,,\\ R_2 &\leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_2})\|\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_2})\,,\\ R_1+R_2 &\leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1})\|\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_1})\\ &\quad +\mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_2})\|\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_2})\\ &\quad -\bar{\mathrm{I}}^{\varepsilon,\delta}_{\max}(A_1 : A_2)_{\psi}, \end{aligned}$$

where the information theoretic quantities above are evaluated with respect to the state $\psi_{FA_1A_2}$. Our result can be thought of as the quantum generalization of the *Marton inner bound* in the one-shot setting [18].

Our techniques: We use the *hypothesis testing* approach to obtain our results with a *position based* decoding measurement by the receiver. To arrive at the achievability rate for **Task 2** we also use the *convex-split lemma* [19] which can be thought as a one-shot quantum analogue of *the covering lemma* [20, Lemma 3.3] in classical information theory. **Task 3** employs the technique of quantum state splitting, along with the techniques used in **Task 2**, thus providing an instance of application of quantum state splitting to quantum channel coding schemes. To arrive our result for **Task 4**, we prove a new generalization of the convex-split lemma. This generalization can be thought as a one-shot quantum analogue of the *mutual covering lemma* [20, Lemma 8.1] in classical information theory. We note that the forms of our bounds match the results for the corresponding tasks in the classical setting. Our results imply the corresponding results in the asymptotic setting, which we discuss in detail in Section 7. Given that we have used uniform techniques for all these tasks, we hope that they find wider applicability in other scenarios of network information theory.

Furthemore, without giving further details we note that our techniques can be analogously used to obtain similar communication bounds for all the tasks studied here involving classical noisy channels or classical-quantum noisy channels with shared randomness between senders and receivers. This would also imply same bounds in the models without shared randomness when we consider average error under any input distribution, by fixing the shared randomness.

Previous works: Previous related works, specially in the one-shot setting, have largely relied on the approach of *decoupling via random unitaries* [6, 12]. Optimal bounds for **Task 1** were shown with special restrictions on the entanglement shared between Alice and Bob [12, 14]. **Task 2** was studied in the one-shot and asymptotic settings in [6] with a different achievability result in the one-shot case. **Task 3** for the classical-quantum channel was studied in [21]. For **Task 4** the best known achievable rate in the classical asymptotic setting was given by Marton [18]. For classical-quantum broadcast channel this problem was studied in [22, 23, 13].

2 Preliminaries

Quantum information theory

Consider a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ endowed with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (in this paper, we only consider finite dimensional Hilbert-spaces). The ℓ_1 norm of an operator X on $\mathcal{H}$ is $\|X\|_1 := \mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ and ℓ_2 norm is $\|X\|_2 := \sqrt{\mathrm{Tr} X X^\dagger}$. A quantum state (or a density matrix or a state) is a positive semi-definite matrix on $\mathcal{H}$ with trace equal to 1. It is called *pure* if and only if its rank is 1. A sub-normalized state is a positive semi-definite matrix on $\mathcal{H}$ with trace less than or equal to 1. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a unit vector on $\mathcal{H}$, that is $\langle \psi, \psi \rangle = 1$. With some abuse of notation, we use ψ to represent the state and also the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, associated with $|\psi\rangle$. Given a quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, *support of* ρ, called $\mathrm{supp}(\rho)$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ spanned by all eigen-vectors of ρ with non-zero eigenvalues.

A *quantum register* A is associated with some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. Define $|A| := \dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Let $\mathcal{L}(A)$ represent the set of all linear operators on $\mathcal{H}_A$. Let $\mathcal{P}(A)$ represent the set of all positive semidefinite operators on $\mathcal{H}_A$. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(A)$, the set of quantum states on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. State ρ with subscript A indicates $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. If two registers A, B are associated with the same Hilbert space, we shall represent the relation by $A \equiv B$. Composition of two registers A and B, denoted AB, is associated with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. For two quantum states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(B)$, $\rho \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ represents the tensor product (Kronecker product) of ρ

and σ. The identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$ (and associated register A) is denoted I_A. For any operator O on $\mathcal{H}_A$, we denote by $\{O\}_+$ the subspace spanned by non-negative eigenvalues of O and by $\{O\}_-$ the subspace spanned by negative eigenvalues of O. For a positive semidefinite operator $M \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, the largest and smallest non-zero eigenvalues of M are denoted by $\lambda_{max}(M)$ and $\lambda_{min}(M)$, respectively.

Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$. We define

$$\rho_B := \mathrm{Tr}_A \rho_{AB} := \sum_i (\langle i| \otimes \mathrm{I}_B)\rho_{AB}(|i\rangle \otimes \mathrm{I}_B),$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. The state $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ is referred to as the marginal state of ρ_{AB}. Unless otherwise stated, a missing register from subscript in a state will represent partial trace over that register. Given a $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, a *purification* of ρ_A is a pure state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}B\rho_{AB} = \rho_A$. Purification of a quantum state is not unique.

A quantum map $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{L}(A) \to \mathcal{L}(B)$ is a completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) linear map (mapping states in $\mathcal{D}(A)$ to states in $\mathcal{D}(B)$). A *unitary* operator $U_A : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $U_A^\dagger U_A = U_A U_A^\dagger = \mathrm{I}_A$. An *isometry* $V : \mathcal{H}_A \to \mathcal{H}_B$ is such that $V^\dagger V = \mathrm{I}_A$ and $VV^\dagger = \mathrm{I}_B$. The set of all unitary operations on register A is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(A)$.

Definition 1. *We shall consider the following information theoretic quantities. Reader is referred to [24, 25, 26, 27, 28] for many of these definitions. We consider only normalized states in the definitions below. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$.*

1. **Fidelity** *For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,*

$$\mathrm{F}(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \|\sqrt{\rho_A}\sqrt{\sigma_A}\|_1.$$

For classical probability distributions $P = \{p_i\}, Q = \{q_i\}$,

$$\mathrm{F}(P, Q) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_i \sqrt{p_i \cdot q_i}.$$

2. **Purified distance** *For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,*

$$\mathrm{P}(\rho_A, \sigma_A) = \sqrt{1 - \mathrm{F}^2(\rho_A, \sigma_A)}.$$

3. **ε-ball** *For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,*

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{\rho'_A \in \mathcal{D}(A) |\ \mathrm{P}(\rho_A, \rho'_A) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

4. **Max-relative entropy** *For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $supp(\rho_A) \subset supp(\sigma_A)$,*

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \inf\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : 2^\lambda \sigma_A \geq \rho_A\}.$$

5. **Smooth max-relative entropy** *For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that $supp(\rho_A) \subset supp(\sigma_A)$,*

$$\mathrm{D}^\varepsilon_{\max}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup_{\rho'_A \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A)} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho'_A \| \sigma_A)\,.$$

6. **Smooth min-relative entropy** *For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$,*

$$\mathrm{D}^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{H}}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup_{0 < \Pi < I, \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho_A) \geq 1-\varepsilon^2} \log\left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma_A)}\right).$$

7. **Information spectrum relative entropy** *For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that supp$(\rho_A) \subset$ supp(σ_A),*

$$\mathrm{D}_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup\{R : \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_A\{\rho_A - 2^R\sigma_A\}_+) \geq 1-\varepsilon\}.$$

8. **Information spectrum relative entropy [Alternate definition]** *For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ such that supp$(\rho_A) \subset$ supp(σ_A),*

$$\tilde{\mathrm{D}}_s^\varepsilon(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \inf\{R : \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_A\{\rho_A - 2^R\sigma_A\}_-) \geq 1-\varepsilon\}.$$

9. **Max-information** *For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, define*

$$\mathrm{I}_{\max}(A:B)_\rho = \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B)\,.$$

10. **Smooth max-information** *For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, define*

$$\mathrm{I}_{\max}^\varepsilon(A:B)_\rho = \min_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho)} \mathrm{I}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho'}.$$

11. **Smooth max-information [Alternate definition]** *For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, define*

$$\tilde{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^\varepsilon(A:B)_\rho = \min_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho)} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho'_{AB}\|\rho'_A \otimes \rho_B)\,.$$

12. **Restricted smooth max-information** *For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, define*

$$\bar{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon,\delta}(A:B)_\rho = \min_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho) : \rho'_A \leq (1+\delta)\rho_A, \rho'_B \leq (1+\delta)\rho_B} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho'_{AB}\|\rho_A \otimes \rho_B)\,.$$

We will use the following facts.

Fact 1 (Triangle inequality for purified distance, [26])**.** *For states $\rho_A, \sigma_A, \tau_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,*

$$\mathrm{P}(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \leq \mathrm{P}(\rho_A, \tau_A) + \mathrm{P}(\tau_A, \sigma_A).$$

Fact 2 (Monotonicity under quantum operations, [29],[30])**.** *For quantum states ρ, $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, and quantum operation $\mathcal{E}(\cdot) : \mathcal{L}(A) \to \mathcal{L}(B)$, it holds that*

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho\|\sigma) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{F}(\mathcal{E}(\rho), \mathcal{E}(\sigma)) \geq \mathrm{F}(\rho,\sigma) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^\varepsilon(\rho\|\sigma) \geq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^\varepsilon(\mathcal{E}(\rho)\|\mathcal{E}(\sigma))\,.$$

In particular, for bipartite states $\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, it holds that

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \geq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{F}(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) \leq \mathrm{F}(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \geq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^\varepsilon(\rho_A\|\sigma_A)\,.$$

Fact 3 (Uhlmann's Theorem, [31])**.** *Let $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ be a purification of ρ_A and $|\sigma\rangle_{AC} \in \mathcal{D}(AC)$ be a purification of σ_A. There exists an isometry $V : C \to B$ such that,*

$$\mathrm{F}(|\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{AB}, |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{AB}) = \mathrm{F}(\rho_A, \sigma_A),$$

where $|\theta\rangle_{AB} = (\mathrm{I}_A \otimes V)|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$.

Fact 4. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ be a quantum state and $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A)$ be another state. There exists an extension σ_{AB} of σ_A such that $\sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{AB})$.*

Proof. Let C be a register such that ρ_{ABC} purifies ρ_{AB}. Then by Uhlmann's theorem (Fact 3), there exists a pure state σ_{ABC} such that $\sigma_{ABC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{ABC})$. The desired result now follows by monotonicity of fidelity under partial trace (Fact 2). □

Fact 5. *Let ρ, σ be quantum states such that $\mathrm{P}(\rho,\sigma) \leq \varepsilon$. Let $0 \leq \Pi \leq \mathrm{I}$ be an operator such that $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho) \geq 1-\delta^2$. Then $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma) \geq 1-(2\varepsilon+\delta)^2$. If $\delta = 0$, then $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma) \geq 1-\varepsilon^2$.*

Proof. Using monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations, we obtain that

$$\sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho)\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma)} + \sqrt{(1-\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho))(1-\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma))} \geq \mathrm{F}(\rho,\sigma) \geq \sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}.$$

Now,

$$\sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho)\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma)} + \sqrt{(1-\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho))(1-\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma))} \leq \sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma)} + \sqrt{\delta(1-\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma))}.$$

We set $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma) = 1-\kappa^2$ and obtain

$$\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2} \leq \sqrt{1-\kappa^2} + \kappa\cdot\delta \implies \frac{\kappa^2-\varepsilon^2}{2} \leq \sqrt{\kappa\delta}.$$

This is satisfied as long as $\kappa \leq 2\varepsilon+\delta$. This proves the fact. The case $\delta = 0$ follows similarly. □

Fact 6 (Pinsker's inequality, [32])**.** *For quantum states $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,*

$$\mathrm{F}(\rho,\sigma) \geq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma)}.$$

Fact 7 (Alicki-Fannes inequality, [33])**.** *Given bipartite quantum states $\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, and $\mathrm{P}(\rho_{AB},\rho_{AB}) = \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2\mathrm{e}}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathrm{I}(A:B)_\rho - \mathrm{I}(A:B)_\sigma| \leq 6\varepsilon\log(|A|) + 4.$$

Fact 8 (Triangle property of smooth max- relative entropy)**.** *For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A), \sigma_A, \tau_A \in \mathcal{P}(A)$, it holds that*

$$\mathrm{D}^\varepsilon_{\max}(\rho_A\|\tau_A) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\sigma_A\|\tau_A) + \mathrm{D}^\varepsilon_{\max}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A).$$

Proof. Let $k \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\sigma_A\|\tau_A)$, which implies that $\sigma_A \leq 2^k\tau_A$. Let $\rho'_A \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A)$ be the state achieving the infimum in $R \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}^\varepsilon_{\max}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A)$. Then $\rho'_A \leq 2^R\sigma_A \leq 2^{R+k}\tau_A$. This implies that $\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho'_A\|\tau_A) \leq R+k$, which concludes the fact using the inequality $\mathrm{D}^\varepsilon_{\max}(\rho_A\|\tau_A) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho'_A\|\tau_A)$. □

Fact 9 (Gentle measurement lemma,[34, 35])**.** *Let ρ be a quantum state and $0 < A < \mathrm{I}$ be an operator. Then*

$$\mathrm{F}(\rho, \frac{A\rho A}{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) \geq \sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)}.$$

Proof. Let $|\rho\rangle$ be a purification of ρ. Then $(\mathrm{I}\otimes A)|\rho\rangle$ is a purification of $A\rho A$. Now, applying monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations (Fact 2), we find

$$\mathrm{F}(\rho, \frac{A\rho A}{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) \geq \mathrm{F}(|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|, \frac{(\mathrm{I}\otimes A)|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|(\mathrm{I}\otimes A^\dagger)}{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) = \sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(A\rho)^2}{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)}} > \sqrt{\mathrm{Tr}(A^2\rho)}.$$

In last inequality, we have used $A > A^2$. □

Fact 10 (Hayashi-Nagaoka inequality, [5])**.** *Let $0 < S < \mathrm{I}, T$ be positive semi-definite operators. Then*

$$(S+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}}T(S+T)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2(\mathrm{I}-S) + 4T.$$

We shall also need the following series of results, that are central to our achievability approach.

Fact 11 ([19]). *Let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots \mu_n, \theta$ be quantum states and $\{p_1, p_2, \dots p_n\}$ be a probability distribution. Let $\mu = \sum_i p_i \mu_i$ be the average state. Then*

$$\mathrm{D}(\mu \| \theta) = \sum_i p_i (\mathrm{D}(\mu_i \| \theta) - \mathrm{D}(\mu_i \| \mu)).$$

Lemma 1 (Convex-split lemma,[19]). *Let $\rho_{PQ} \in \mathcal{D}(PQ)$ and $\sigma_Q \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$ be quantum states such that $supp(\rho_Q) \subset supp(\sigma_Q)$. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$. Define the following state*

$$\tau_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}$$

on $n+1$ registers $P, Q_1, Q_2, \dots Q_n$, where $\forall j \in [n] : \rho_{PQ_j} = \rho_{PQ}$ and $\sigma_{Q_j} = \sigma_Q$. Then for $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $n = \lceil \frac{2^k}{\delta^2} \rceil$,

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \leq \delta.$$

We have the following corollary of above lemma.

Corollary 1 (Corollary of convex-split lemma). *For an $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $\rho_{PQ} \in \mathcal{D}(PQ)$ and $\sigma_Q \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$ be quantum states such that $supp(\rho_Q) \subset supp(\sigma_Q)$. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{PQ})} \mathrm{D}_{\max}\left(\rho'_{PQ} \middle\| \rho'_P \otimes \sigma_Q\right)$. Define the following state*

$$\tau_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}$$

on $n+1$ registers $P, Q_1, Q_2, \dots Q_n$, where $\forall j \in [n] : \rho_{PQ_j} = \rho_{PQ}$ and $\sigma_{Q_j} = \sigma_Q$. For $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $n = \lceil \frac{2^k}{\delta^2} \rceil$,

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \leq 2\varepsilon + \delta.$$

Proof. Let ρ'_{PQ} be the state achieving infimum in

$$\inf_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{PQ})} \mathrm{D}_{\max}\left(\rho'_{PQ} \middle\| \rho'_P \otimes \sigma_Q\right).$$

It holds that $\mathrm{P}(\rho_{PQ}, \rho'_{PQ}) \leq \varepsilon$. Define the state

$$\tau'_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \rho'_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}.$$

Then by convex-split lemma, and the choice of n, it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau'_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \tau'_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \leq \delta.$$

Moreover, using the concavity of fidelity (Theorem 9.7, [37]), $\mathrm{P}(\tau'_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \tau_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n}) \leq \mathrm{P}(\rho'_{PQ}, \rho_{PQ}) \leq \varepsilon$. Similarly, $\mathrm{P}(\tau'_P, \tau_P) = \mathrm{P}(\tau'_P, \rho_P) \leq \varepsilon$. Thus, by triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1),

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \rho_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \leq 2\varepsilon + \delta.$$

□

We will use the following new version of the convex split lemma.

Lemma 2 (Bi-partite convex-split lemma)**.** *Let $\rho_{PQ} \in \mathcal{D}(PQ)$ be a quantum state, $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bar{\mathrm{I}}^{\varepsilon,\delta}_{\max}(P:Q)_\rho$. Choose integers $n, m > \frac{1}{\delta}$ and define the following state*

$$\tau_{P_1 \dots P_m Q_1 \dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n \cdot m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \rho_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho_{P_1} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_{i-1}} \otimes \rho_{P_{i+1}} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_m} \otimes \rho_{Q_1} \otimes \dots \rho_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \rho_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \rho_{Q_n}$$

on registers $P_1, P_2 \dots P_m, Q_1, Q_2, \dots Q_n$, where $\forall i, j \in [n] : \rho_{P_i Q_j} = \rho_{PQ}$, $\rho_{P_i} = \rho_P$ and $\rho_{Q_j} = \rho_Q$. Then,

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau_{P_1 P_2 \dots P_m Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \rho_{P_1} \otimes \rho_{P_2} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_m} \otimes \rho_{Q_1} \otimes \rho_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \rho_{Q_n}) \leq \varepsilon + 2\sqrt{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{2^k}{n \cdot m}}.$$

In particular, if it is possible to further choose n, m such that $n \cdot m \geq \lceil \frac{2^k}{\delta} \rceil$, we find that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau_{P_1 P_2 \dots P_m Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}, \rho_{P_1} \otimes \rho_{P_2} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_m} \otimes \rho_{Q_1} \otimes \rho_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \rho_{Q_n}) \leq \varepsilon + 3\sqrt{\delta}.$$

The proof closely follows the original proof of convex split lemma from [19].

Proof. Let ρ'_{PQ} be the quantum state achieving the optimum in the definition of $\bar{\mathrm{I}}^{\varepsilon,\delta}_{\max}(P:Q)_\rho$. We shall work with the state

$$\tau'_{P_1 \dots P_m Q_1 \dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n \cdot m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \rho'_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho_{P_1} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_{i-1}} \otimes \rho_{P_{i+1}} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_m} \otimes \rho_{Q_1} \otimes \dots \rho_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \rho_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \rho_{Q_n}$$

Define,

$$\rho^{-(i,j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho_{P_1} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_{i-1}} \otimes \rho_{P_{i+1}} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_m} \otimes \rho_{Q_1} \dots \otimes \rho_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \rho_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \rho_{Q_n},$$

$$\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho_{P_1} \otimes \rho_{P_2} \otimes \dots \rho_{P_m} \otimes \rho_{Q_1} \otimes \rho_{Q_2} \dots \rho_{Q_n}.$$

Then

$$\tau'_{P_1 P_2 \dots P_m Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n} = \frac{1}{n \cdot m} \sum_{i,j} \rho'_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)}.$$

Now, we use Fact 11 to express

$$\mathrm{D}\left(\tau'_{P_1 \dots P_m Q_1 \dots Q_n} \| \rho\right) = \frac{1}{n \cdot m} \sum_{i,j} \mathrm{D}\left(\rho'_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \middle\| \rho\right) -$$
$$\frac{1}{n \cdot m} \sum_{i,j} \mathrm{D}\left(\rho'_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \middle\| \tau'_{P_1 P_2 \dots P_m Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}\right). \tag{1}$$

Note that,

$$\mathrm{D}\Big(\rho'_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \Big\| \rho\Big) = \mathrm{D}\Big(\rho'_{P_i Q_j} \Big\| \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}\Big) \text{ and } \mathrm{D}\Big(\rho'_{P_i Q_j} \otimes \rho^{-(i,j)} \Big\| \tau'_{P_1 P_2 \dots P_m Q_1 Q_2 \dots Q_n}\Big) \geq \mathrm{D}\Big(\rho'_{P_i Q_j} \Big\| \tau'_{P_i Q_j}\Big),$$

as relative entropy decreases under partial trace. Observe that

$$\tau'_{P_i Q_j} = \frac{1}{n \cdot m} \rho'_{P_i Q_j} + \frac{1}{n}(1 - \frac{1}{m}) \rho'_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j} + \frac{1}{m}(1 - \frac{1}{n}) \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho'_{Q_j} + (1 - \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n \cdot m}) \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}.$$

By assumption, $\rho'_{P_iQ_j} \leq 2^k \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}, \rho'_{P_i} \leq (1+\delta)\rho_{P_i}, \rho'_{Q_i} \leq (1+\delta)\rho_{Q_i}$. Hence $\tau'_{P_iQ_j} \leq (1 + \frac{1+\delta}{n} + \frac{1+\delta}{m} + \frac{2^k-1}{n\cdot m})\rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}$. Since $\log(A) \leq \log(B)$ if $A \leq B$ for positive semi-definite matrices A and B, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \middle\| \tau'_{P_iQ_j}\right) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \log \rho_{P_iQ_j}) - \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \log \tau'_{P_iQ_j}) \\
&\geq \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \log \rho_{P_iQ_j}) - \mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \log(\rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j})) - \log\left(1 + \frac{1+\delta}{n} + \frac{1+\delta}{m} + \frac{2^k-1}{n\cdot m}\right) \\
&= \mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \middle\| \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}\right) - \log\left(1 + \frac{1+\delta}{n} + \frac{1+\delta}{m} + \frac{2^k-1}{n\cdot m}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using in Equation 1, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{D}\left(\tau'_{P_1P_2\ldots P_mQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n} \middle\| \rho\right) \quad &\leq \quad \frac{1}{n\cdot m}\sum_{i,j} \mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \middle\| \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}\right) - \frac{1}{n\cdot m}\sum_{i,j} \mathrm{D}\left(\rho_{P_iQ_j} \middle\| \rho_{P_i} \otimes \rho_{Q_j}\right) \\
&+ \quad \log\left(1 + \frac{1+\delta}{n} + \frac{1+\delta}{m} + \frac{2^k-1}{n\cdot m}\right) \leq \log\left(1 + 2\cdot\delta(1+\delta) + \frac{2^k-1}{n\cdot m}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Above, the last inequality follows by the choice of n, m. Thus, by Pinsker's inequality (Fact 6), we obtain that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau'_{P_1P_2\ldots P_mQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}, \rho) \leq \sqrt{2\cdot\delta(1+\delta) + \frac{2^k}{n\cdot m}} \leq 2\sqrt{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{2^k}{n\cdot m}}.$$

Since $\mathrm{P}(\tau'_{P_1P_2\ldots P_mQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}, \tau_{P_1P_2\ldots P_mQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}) \leq \mathrm{P}(\rho'_{PQ}, \rho_{PQ}) \leq \varepsilon$, triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1) shows that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau'_{P_1P_2\ldots P_mQ_1Q_2\ldots Q_n}, \rho) \leq \varepsilon + 2\sqrt{\delta} + \sqrt{\frac{2^k}{n\cdot m}}.$$

This proves first part of the lemma. The second part follows from our choice of $n \cdot m$.

□

3 Point to point channel

Description of task



Figure 1: A sketch of general encoding and decoding entanglement assisted protocol for point to point channel

There are two parties Alice and Bob . Alice wants to communicate a classical message M chosen from $[1 : 2^R]$ to Bob over a quantum channel such that Bob is able to decode the correct message with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon^2$, for all message m. To accomplish this task Alice and Bob also share entanglement between them. Let the input to Alice be given in a register M. We now make the following definition, illustrated in Figure 1:

Definition 2. *Let $|\theta\rangle_{E_A E_B}$ be the shared entanglement between* Alice *and* Bob . *An (R, ε)-entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}$ consists of*

- *An encoding unitary $\mathcal{E} : ME_A \to A$ for* Alice .
- *A decoding operation $\mathcal{D} : BE_B \to M'$ for* Bob*, with $M' \equiv M$ being the output register such that for all m,*

$$\Pr(M' \neq m | M = m) \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

An achievability protocol

We show the following result.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}$ be the quantum channel and let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$. Let $A' \equiv A$ be a purifying register. Then, for any R satisfying*

$$R \leq \max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'}} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'}) \| \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_A) \otimes \psi_{A'}) - 2\log\frac{1}{\delta}, \tag{2}$$

there exists an $(R, 2\varepsilon + 2\delta)$ entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}$.



Figure 2: A schematic for the achievability protocol. Upon receiving the message m, Alice sends the m-th register in the entanglement through the channel to Bob.

Proof. Fix $\psi_{AA'}$ and R as given in Equation 2. Introduce the registers $A_1, A_2, \ldots A_{2^R}$, such that $A_i \equiv A$ and $A'_1, A'_2, \ldots A'_{2^R}$ such that $A'_i \equiv A'$. Alice and Bob share the state

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A_1 A'_1} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A_2 A'_2}, \ldots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A_{2^R} A'_{2^R}},$$

where Alice holds the registers $A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_{2^R}$ and Bob holds the registers $A'_1, A'_2, \cdots, A'_{2^R}$. Let, $0 \preceq \Pi_{BA'} \preceq \mathrm{I}$ be such that

$$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'}) \| \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_A) \otimes \psi_{A'}) := -\log \mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi_{BA'} \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_A) \otimes \psi_{A'}\right].$$

Our protocol is as follows (see also Figure 2):

Encoding: Alice on receiving the message $m \in [1 : 2^R]$ sends the register A_m over the channel. Notice that after this transmission over the channel the state in Bob 's possession is the following:

$$\hat{\Theta}_{B,A'_1\cdots,A'_{2^R}} := \psi_{A'_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{N}^{A_m \to B}\left(\psi_{A_m A'_m}\right) \cdots \otimes \psi_{A'_{2^R}}.$$

Further, notice that $\hat{\Theta}_{BA'_j}$ state between the register A'_j and the channel output B is the following

$$\hat{\Theta}_{BA'_j} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'}) & \text{if } \ j = m; \\ \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_A) \otimes \psi_{A'} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Decoding: For each $m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$, we have the operators $\Pi_{A'_m}$ as defined in (3). Using this, we define for each m,

$$\Lambda(m) := \mathrm{I}_{A'_1} \otimes \mathrm{I}_{A'_2} \otimes \cdots \Pi_{BA'_m} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{I}_{A'_{2^R}}.$$

The decoding POVM element corresponding to m is:

$$\Omega(m) := \left(\sum_{m' \in [1:2^R]} \Lambda(m')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda(m) \left(\sum_{m' \in [1:2^R]} \Lambda(m')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is easy to observe that $\sum_m \Omega(m) = \mathrm{I}$, and hence it forms a valid POVM.

Probability of error: Let M be the message which was transmitted by Alice using the strategy above and let M' be the decoded message by Bob using the above mentioned decoding POVMs. Notice that by the symmetry of the encoding and decoding strategy, it is enough to show that $\Pr\{M' \neq 1 \mid M = 1\} \leq 2\varepsilon + 4\delta$, under the event that $M = 1$ is the transmitted message.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{M' \neq 1 | M = 1\} &= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\mathrm{I} - \Omega(1)\right)\hat{\Theta}_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^R}}\right] \\ &\overset{a}{\leq} 2\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\mathrm{I} - \Lambda(1)\right)\hat{\Theta}_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^R}}\right] + 4\sum_{m\neq 1} \mathrm{Tr}\left[\Lambda(m)\hat{\Theta}_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^R}}\right] \\ &\overset{b}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2 + 4 \times 2^{R - \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'})\|\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_A)\otimes\psi_{A'})} \\ &\overset{c}{\leq} 2\varepsilon + 4\delta^2 \leq 4(\varepsilon + \delta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

where a follows from Hayashi-Nagaoka operator inequality (Fact 10); b follows from the definition of $\Lambda(m)$, and from the definition of $\Pi_{BA'}$ and c follows from the choice of R as mentioned in the Theorem. This completes the proof. □

For the same task without shared entanglement, we run the same protocol in which the state $\psi_{AA'}$ is classical-quantum with A' being classical, which is held by Bob. We can fix the classical part and obtain a protocol without shared entanglement, for average bounded error under a given input distribution.

A converse bound

We provide a new proof of a converse for this task. Our converse bound applies for average error under the uniform distribution (and hence for worst case error for each m). Let the input to Alice be given in a register M. Let it be maximally correlated with a register $\hat{M}$ inaccessible to both parties and $\tau_{M\hat{M}}$ represent the state $\frac{1}{2^R}\sum_m |m\rangle\langle m|_M \otimes |m\rangle\langle m|_{\hat{M}}$.

Definition 3. *Let $|\theta\rangle_{E_A E_B}$ be the shared entanglement between* Alice *and* Bob *. An (R, ε)-entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}$ consists of*

- *An encoding unitary $\mathcal{E} : ME_A \to A$ for* Alice *.*
- *A decoding operation $\mathcal{D} : BE_B \to M'$ for* Bob*, with $M' \equiv M$ being the output register such that*

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau_{M'\hat{M}}, \mathcal{D} \circ \mathcal{N}_{A\to B} \circ U(\tau_{\hat{M}M} \otimes \theta_{E_A E_B})) \leq \varepsilon.$$

We prove the following converse bound for R.

Theorem 2. *Fix $\varepsilon > 0, \delta > 0$. For any (R, ε)-entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}$, it holds that*

$$R \leq 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \max_{|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{AA'}} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{3\delta+\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_{AA'}) \| \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_A) \otimes \psi_{A'}),$$

where the register $A' \equiv A$.

Proof. Let $\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}$ be the state in registers $\hat{M}BE_B$ just after Bob receives the output from the channel and before he applies his decoding operation. Let Π_+ be the projector onto the positive part of the operator $\frac{1}{\delta^2}\rho_{BE_B} - \rho_B \otimes \rho_{E_B}$. Let Π_- be the projector orthogonal to Π_+. It holds that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_- \rho_{BE_B}) \leq \delta^2 \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_- \rho_B \otimes \rho_{E_B}) \leq \delta^2.$$

Define $\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{(\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}(\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_+\rho_{BE_B})}$. We have the following claim.

Claim 1. *Following properties hold for $\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}$.*

- $\mathrm{P}(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}, \rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \leq \delta$.
- *For any positive operator A satisfying $\Pi_+ A \Pi_+ = A$, $\mathrm{Tr}(A\sigma_{BE_B}) \geq \delta \cdot \mathrm{Tr}(A\rho_B \otimes \rho_E)$.*
- $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{D}(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}), \tau_{\hat{M}M'}) \leq \varepsilon + \delta$.

Proof. We prove each item in the order.

- This follows from the gentle measurement Lemma 9.
- We proceed as follows:

$$\mathrm{Tr}(A\sigma_{BE_B}) \geq \mathrm{Tr}(A\Pi_+\rho_{BE_B}\Pi_+) \geq \delta^2 \mathrm{Tr}(A\Pi_+\rho_B \otimes \rho_E \Pi_+) = \delta^2 \mathrm{Tr}(A\rho_B \otimes \rho_E),$$

  where the last equality follows by $\Pi_+ A \Pi_+ = A$.

- Using the relations $\mathrm{P}(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}, \rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \leq \delta$, $\mathrm{P}(\mathcal{D}(\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}), \tau_{\hat{M}M'}) \leq \varepsilon$, triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1) and monotonicity of purified distance under quantum operations (Fact 2), the desired follows.

□

An immediate consequence of the claim is the following. Consider the projector $\Sigma_{M\hat{M}} = \sum_m |m\rangle\langle m|_{\hat{M}} \otimes |m\rangle\langle m|_{M'}$. It holds that $\mathrm{Tr}(\Sigma_{\hat{M}M'}\tau_{\hat{M}M'}) = 1$. From Fact 5, it implies that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Sigma_{\hat{M}M'}\mathcal{D}(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B})) \geq 1 - (\varepsilon + \delta)^2.$$

But, $\mathrm{Tr}(\Sigma_{\hat{M}M'}\rho_{\hat{M}} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\sigma_{BE_B})) = \frac{1}{2^R}\mathrm{Tr}(\mathcal{D}(\sigma_{BE_B})) = \frac{1}{2^R}$. Thus,

$$R \leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon+\delta}\left(\mathcal{D}(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \middle\| \rho_{\hat{M}} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\sigma_{BE_B})\right) \stackrel{a}{\leq} \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon+\delta}\left(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B} \middle\| \rho_{\hat{M}} \otimes \sigma_{BE_B}\right), \tag{3}$$

where (a) follows from monotonicity under quantum operation (Fact 2). Let Π be the projector such that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \geq 1-(\varepsilon+\delta)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad -\log \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}) = \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon+\delta}\left(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}\right).$$

Observe that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}) = \mathrm{Tr}((\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)\Pi(\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}) = \mathrm{Tr}((\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)\Pi(\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}).$$

Thus, we can equally well consider $\tilde{\Pi} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)\Pi(\mathrm{I}\otimes\Pi_+)$ as our desired operator. We proceed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon+\delta}\left(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}\right) &= -\log\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}) \\ &= -\log\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\rho_B\otimes\rho_{E_B}) + \log\left(\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\rho_B\otimes\rho_{E_B})}{\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B})}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Defining $A' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathrm{Tr}_M(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}})$, we note that $\Pi_+A'\Pi_+ = A'$. Using Claim 1, this leads to

$$\frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\rho_B\otimes\rho_{E_B})}{\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B})} = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(A\rho_B\otimes\rho_{E_B})}{\mathrm{Tr}(A\sigma_{BE_B})} \leq \frac{1}{\delta^2}.$$

Moreover, from Claim 1, $\mathrm{P}(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B},\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \leq \delta$. Thus, Fact 5 implies

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{\Pi}\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}) \geq 1-(3\delta+\varepsilon)^2.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon+\delta}\left(\sigma_{\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\sigma_{BE_B}\right) &\leq 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{3\delta+\varepsilon}\left(\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{\hat{M}}\otimes\rho_B\otimes\rho_{E_B}\right) \\ &= 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{3\delta+\varepsilon}\left(\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{\hat{M}E_B}\otimes\rho_B\right).\end{aligned}$$

where last equality follows since $\rho_{E_B\hat{M}} = \rho_{E_B}\otimes\rho_{\hat{M}}$. From Equation 3, this gives

$$\log(M) \leq 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{3\delta+\varepsilon}\left(\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{\hat{M}E_B}\otimes\rho_B\right).$$

Let the state in registers $\hat{M}AE_B$, just before Alice inputs A to the channel be $\psi_{\hat{M}AE_B}$. Then $\rho_{\hat{M}BE_B} = \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_{\hat{M}AE_B})$. We introduce a register S such that $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{S\hat{M}AE_B}$ is a purification of $\psi_{\hat{M}AE_B}$. Consider the extended state $\rho_{S\hat{M}AE_B} = \mathcal{N}_{A\to B}(\psi_{S\hat{M}AE_B})$. We have that

$$\log(M) \leq 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{3\delta+\varepsilon}\left(\rho_{S\hat{M}BE_B}\middle\|\rho_{SE_B\hat{M}}\otimes\rho_B\right).$$

Introducing a register $A' \equiv A$ and applying an isometry $W : SE_B\hat{M} \to A'$ to obtain the state $|\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|_{A'A} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} W(\psi_{S\hat{M}AE_B})W^\dagger$, we conclude that

$$\log(M) \leq 2\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{3\delta+\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}(\psi'_{A'A})\|\psi'_{A'}\otimes\mathcal{N}(\psi'_A)).$$

This completes the proof. □

4 Quantum side information about the channel at the encoder

Description of task



Figure 3: A sketch of general encoding and decoding entanglement assisted protocol for point to point channel with quantum side information at the encoder

Alice wants to communicate a classical message M chosen from $[1:2^R]$ to Bob over a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ such that Bob is able to decode the correct message with probability at least $1-\varepsilon^2$. Alice shares entanglement with the channel as well. This model in the classical setting is called as the *Gel'fand-Pinsker* channel, depicted in Figure 3.

Definition 4. *Let $|\theta\rangle_{E_A E_B}$ be the shared entanglement between* Alice *and* Bob *and let $|\phi\rangle_{SS'}$ be the state shared between* Alice *and Channel. An (R,ε)-entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ consists of*

- *An encoding operation $\mathcal{E}: ME_AS \to A$ for* Alice .
- *A decoding operation $\mathcal{D}: BE_B \to M'$ for* Bob*, with $M' \equiv M$ being the output register such that for all m,*

$$\Pr(M' \neq m | M = m) \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

An achievability protocol

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ be a quantum channel, $\phi_{SS'}$ be a pure quantum state and let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$. Then, for any R satisfying*

$$R \leq \max_{\psi_{AA'S}:\psi_S=\phi_S} \left(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AA'S}) \| \mathcal{N}(\psi_{AS}) \otimes \psi_{A'}) - \tilde{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(A':S)_{\psi} \right) - 4\log\frac{1}{\delta}, \qquad (4)$$

there exists an $(R, 6\varepsilon+4\delta)$-entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$.

Proof. Fix $\psi_{AA'S}$ such that $\psi_S = \phi_S$, which achieves the maximum in Equation 4 and fix an R as given in Equation 4. Set $r = \tilde{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(A':S)_{\psi} + 2\log\frac{1}{\delta}$.

Let A'' be a register such that $|\psi\rangle_{A''A'}$ is a purification of $\psi_{A'}$. Introduce the registers $A''_1, A''_2, \ldots A''_{2^{R+r}}$, such that $A''_i \equiv A''$ and $A'_1, A'_2, \ldots A'_{2^{R+r}}$ such that $A'_i \equiv A'$. Alice and Bob share the state

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_1A'_1} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_2A'_2}, \ldots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_{2^{R+r}}A'_{2^{R+r}}},$$

where Alice holds the registers $A''_1, A''_2, \cdots, A''_{2^{R+r}}$ and Bob holds the registers $A'_1, A'_2, \cdots, A'_{2^{R+r}}$.



Figure 4: A schematic for the achievability protocol. Upon receiving the message m, Alice uses the block $\mathcal{B}(m)$ to transmit the message to Bob.

We divide these copies of shared entanglement into blocks, each of size 2^r, where the block $\mathcal{B}(j)$ involves the registers $A''_{(j-1)\cdot 2^r+1}A'_{(j-1)\cdot 2^r+1},\dots A''_{j\cdot 2^r}A'_{j\cdot 2^r}$. For brevity, we set $st(j) = (j-1)\cdot 2^r+1, en(j) = j\cdot 2^r$. Define the following state corresponding to block j.

$$\tau^j_{SA'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(j)} \psi_{SA'_k}\otimes\psi_{A'_{st(j)}}\dots\otimes\psi_{A'_{k-1}}\otimes\psi_{A'_{k+1}}\dots\otimes\psi_{A'_{en(j)}}.$$

Introduce a register C such that $|\Psi\rangle_{CAA'S}$ is a purification of $\psi_{AA'S}$. Consider the following purification of $\tau^j_{SA'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}}$.

$$|\tau^j\rangle_{KACSA''_{st(j)}\dots A''_{en(j)}A'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{r/2}}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(j)} |k\rangle_K|\Psi\rangle_{CASA'_k}\otimes$$
$$|\psi\rangle_{A''_{st(j)}A'_{st(j)}}\dots\otimes|\psi\rangle_{A''_{k-1}A'_{k-1}}\otimes|0\rangle_{A''_k}\otimes|\psi\rangle_{A''_{k+1}A'_{k+1}}\dots\otimes|\psi\rangle_{A''_{en(j)}A'_{en(j)}}.$$

From the corollary of convex split lemma (Corollary 1), and the choice of r, it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau^j_{SA'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}}, \psi_S\otimes\psi_{A'_{st(j)}}\dots\otimes\psi_{A'_{en(j)}}) \le 2\varepsilon+\delta.$$

Thus, there exists an isometry $U^j : S'A''_{st(j)}\dots A''_{en(j)} \to KACA''_{st(j)}\dots A''_{en(j)}$ such that (by Uhlmann's Theorem, Fact 3)

$$\mathrm{P}(|\tau^j\rangle\langle\tau^j|_{KACSA''_{st(j)}\dots A''_{en(j)}A'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}}, U|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{SS'}\otimes|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_{st(j)}A'_{st(j)}}\otimes\dots|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_{en(j)}A'_{en(j)}}U^\dagger) \le 2\varepsilon+\delta.$$

Our protocol works as follows, also depicted in Figure 4.

Encoding: Alice on receiving the message $m\in[1:2^R]$ considers the block $\mathcal{B}(m)$. She applies the isometry U^m on registers $S'A'_{st(m)}\dots A''_{en(m)}$ and sends the register A through the channel. Let the state in Bob 's possession after this transmission over the channel be $\hat{\Theta}_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^R}}$. Define

the state

$$\Theta_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R+r}}} := \frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(m)} \mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_k}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_1}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{k-1}}\otimes\psi_{A'_{k+1}}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}.$$

From Equation 8, and monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations (Fact 2), it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\Theta_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R+r}}}, \hat{\Theta}_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R+r}}}) \leq 2\varepsilon+\delta. \tag{5}$$

Decoding: Let, $0\preceq\Pi_{BA'}\preceq \mathrm{I}$ be such that

$$\mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{ASA'})\|\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'}) := -\log\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi_{BA'}\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'}\right].$$

Using this, we define for each $j\in[1:2^{R_1}]$,

$$\Lambda(j) := \mathrm{I}_{A'_1}\otimes\mathrm{I}_{A'_2}\otimes\cdots\Pi_{BA'_j}\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathrm{I}_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}.$$

For $j\in[1:2^{R+r}]$, define the operator

$$\Omega(j) := \left(\sum_{j'\in[1:2^{R+r}]}\Lambda(j')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Lambda(j)\left(\sum_{j'\in[1:2^{R+r}]}\Lambda(j')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is easy to observe that $\sum_j\Omega(j)=\mathrm{I}$, and hence it forms a valid POVM. Bob applies the POVM $\{\Omega(j)\}_j$. Upon obtaining the outcome j, he outputs the block number corresponding to j.

Probability of error: Let M be the message which was transmitted by Alice using the strategy above and let M' be the decoded message by Bob using the above mentioned decoding POVMs. Notice that by the symmetry of the encoding and decoding strategy, it is enough to show that $\Pr\{M'\neq 1\mid M=1\}\leq(6\varepsilon+4\delta)^2$, under the event that $M=1$ is the transmitted message. We begin with the following calculation.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\notin\mathcal{B}(1)}\Omega(k')\right)\Theta_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^{R+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{a}{=}\frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(1)}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\notin\mathcal{B}(1)}\Omega(k')\right)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_k}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_1}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{k-1}}\otimes\psi_{A'_{k+1}}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}\right]\\
&\leq\frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(1)}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\neq k}\Omega(k')\right)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_k}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_1}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{k-1}}\otimes\psi_{A'_{k+1}}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{b}{=}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\neq 1}\Omega(k')\right)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_1}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_2}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{c}{\leq} 2\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathrm{I}-\Lambda(1))\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_1}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_2}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}\right]\\
&\quad+4\sum_{k'\neq 1}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Lambda(m)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_1}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_2}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{d}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2+4\times 2^{R+r-\mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{ASA'})\|\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'})}\\
&\overset{e}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2+4\delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Above a follows from the definition of $\Theta_{A_1',B_1\cdots,B_{2^{R+r}}}$; b follows from the symmetry of the code construction; c follows from Hayashi-Nagaoka operator inequality (Fact 10); d follows from the definition of $\Lambda(m)$ and from the definition of $\Pi_{BA'}$ and e follows from the choice of $R+r$.

Now, notice that

$$\Pr\{M' \neq 1 | M = 1\} \leq \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k' \notin \mathcal{B}(1)} \Omega(k')\right) \hat{\Theta}_{A_1',B_1\cdots,B_{2^{R+r}}}\right].$$

Thus, using Fact 5 and Equation 5, we have that

$$\Pr\{M' \neq 1 | M = 1\} \leq (\sqrt{2\varepsilon^2 + 4\delta^2} + 4\varepsilon + 2\delta)^2 \leq (6\varepsilon + 4\delta)^2.$$

This completes the proof. □

5 Limited quantum side information about the channel at the encoder

Description of problem

Alice wants to communicate a classical message M chosen from $[1 : 2^R]$ to Bob over a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ such that Bob is able to decode the correct message with probability at least $1-\varepsilon$. To accomplish this task, Charlie aids Alice by sending a variation of his entanglement that he shares with the channel, as shown in the Figure 5 below.



Figure 5: A sketch of general encoding and decoding entanglement assisted protocol for point to point channel with rate limited quantum side information at the encoder.

Definition 5. *Let $|\theta\rangle_{E_AE_BE_C}$ be the shared entanglement between* Alice , Bob *and* Charlie. *Let $|\phi\rangle_{SS'}$ be the state shared between* Charlie *(S') and the Channel (S). An (R_1, R_2, ε) entanglement assisted code for the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ consists of*

- *A state encoder $\mathcal{E}_C : E_CS' \to T$ for Charlie.*
- *An encoding operation $\mathcal{E}_A : MTE_A \to A$ for* Alice .

- *A decoding operation* $\mathcal{D} : BE_B \to M'$*, with* $M' \equiv M$ *being the output register such that for all* m*,*

$$\Pr(M' \neq m | M = m) \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

An achievability protocol

Theorem 4. *Let* $\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}$ *be the quantum channel,* $|\phi\rangle_{S'S}$ *be a pure quantum state and* $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$*. Let* $S' \equiv CT$ *be a decomposition of register* S' *and* $\psi_{AA'CS}$ *be a state such that* $\psi_{CS} = \phi_{CS}$*. Then, for* (R_1, R_2) *satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AA'S}) \| \mathcal{N}(\psi_{AS}) \otimes \psi_{A'}) - \tilde{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(A' : CS)_{\psi} - 4 \log \frac{1}{\delta}, \\ R_2 &\geq \tilde{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(S : T)_{\phi} + 4 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

there exists an $(R_1, R_2, 5\varepsilon + 2\delta)$ *entanglement assisted code.*



Figure 6: A schematic for the achievability protocol. Upon receiving the message m, Alice uses the block $\mathcal{B}(m)$ to transmit the message to Bob. Furthermore, Alice and Charlie also employ a entanglement assisted quantum state splitting protocol between each other.

Proof. Fix a $\psi_{AA'CS}$ such that $\psi_{CS} = \phi_{CS}$ and fix an R_1 as given in Equation 6. Set $r = \tilde{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon}(A' : CS)_{\psi} + 2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}$. Let A'' be a register such that $|\psi\rangle_{A''A'}$ is a purification of $\psi_{A'}$. Introduce the

registers $A''_1, A''_2, \dots A''_{2^{R_1+r}}$, such that $A''_i \equiv A''$, $A'_1, A'_2, \dots A'_{2^{R_1+r}}$ and $A'_i \equiv A'$. Alice and Bob share the state

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_1A'_1} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_2A'_2}, \dots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_{2^{R_1+r}}A'_{2^{R_1+r}}},$$

where Alice holds the registers $A''_1, A''_2, \cdots, A''_{2^{R_1+r}}$ and Bob holds the registers $A'_1, A'_2, \cdots, A'_{2^{R_1+r}}$.

We divide these copies of shared entanglement into blocks, each of size 2^r, where the block $\mathcal{B}(j)$ involves the registers $A''_{(j-1)\cdot 2^r+1}A'_{(j-1)\cdot 2^r+1}, \dots A''_{j\cdot 2^r}A'_{j\cdot 2^r}$. For brevity, we set $st(j) = (j-1)\cdot 2^r + 1, en(j) = j \cdot 2^r$. Define the following state corresponding to block j.

$$\tau^j_{SA'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^r} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(j)} \psi_{CSA'_k} \otimes \psi_{A'_{st(j)}} \dots \otimes \psi_{A'_{k-1}} \otimes \psi_{A'_{k+1}} \dots \otimes \psi_{A'_{en(j)}}.$$

Introduce a register P such that $|\Psi\rangle_{PAA'CS}$ is a purification of $\psi_{AA'CS}$. Consider the following purification of $\tau^j_{CSA'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}}$.

$$|\tau^j\rangle_{KAPCSA''_{st(j)}\dots A''_{en(j)}A'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{r/2}} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(j)} |k\rangle_K |\Psi\rangle_{PACSA'_k} \otimes$$
$$|\psi\rangle_{A''_{st(j)}A'_{st(j)}} \dots \otimes |\psi\rangle_{A''_{k-1}A'_{k-1}} \otimes |0\rangle_{A''_k} \otimes |\psi\rangle_{A''_{k+1}A'_{k+1}} \dots \otimes |\psi\rangle_{A''_{en(j)}A'_{en(j)}}.$$

From corollary of convex-split lemma (Corollary 1), and the choice of R_1, R, it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau^j_{CSA'_{st(j)}\dots A'_{en(j)}}, \psi_{CS} \otimes \psi_{A'_{st(j)}} \dots \otimes \psi_{A'_{en(j)}}) \leq 2\varepsilon + \delta. \tag{7}$$

Now, from Equation 7, for every j, there exists an isometry

$$U^j : T'A''_{st(j)} \dots A''_{en(j)} \to KAPCA''_{st(j)} \dots A''_{en(j)}$$

such that (by Uhlmann's Theorem, Fact 3),

$$\mathrm{P}(U^{j\dagger}|\tau^j\rangle\langle\tau^j|U^j, |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|_{T'CS} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_{st(j)}A'_{st(j)}} \otimes \dots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A''_{en(j)}A'_{en(j)}}) \leq 2\varepsilon + \delta. \tag{8}$$

Our protocol is as follows, see also Figure 6.

State splitting between Alice and Charlie: Alice and Charlie employ the state splitting protocol for the state ψ_{CTS} [19] (see also [38] for related result). Alice and Charlie share a state $|\theta\rangle_{E_AE_C}$. Charlie applies a unitary $V_c : E_CTC \to W_CZ$, where Z is the message register and W_C is the remaining register with Charlie. Charlie sends the register Z to Alice . Alice applies a unitary $V_a : E_AZ \to W_AT'$, where $T' \equiv T$ and W_A is the remaining register with Alice . The final state $\psi'_{CST'}$ is such that $\phi'_{CST'} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\phi_{CST})$. The number of qubits communicated in the protocol is at least $\tilde{\mathrm{I}}^\varepsilon_{\max}(S:T)_\phi + 4\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$.

Alice's Encoding: Alice on receiving the message $m \in [1 : 2^{R_1}]$ and register T' from Charlie, considers the block $\mathcal{B}(m)$. She applies the isometry U^m on registers $T'A'_{st(m)} \dots A''_{en(m)}$. Then she sends the register A through the channel. Let the state in Bob 's possession after this transmission over the channel be $\hat{\Theta}_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}$. Define the state

$$\Theta_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R_1+r}}} := \frac{1}{2^r} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(m)} \mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_k}\right) \otimes \psi_{A'_1} \dots \otimes \psi_{A'_{k-1}} \otimes \psi_{A'_{k+1}} \dots \otimes \psi_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}.$$

From Equation 8, the relation $\phi'_{CST'} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\phi_{CST})$ and monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations, it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\Theta_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}, \hat{\Theta}_{BA'_1\cdots,A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}) \leq 3\varepsilon + \delta. \tag{9}$$

Decoding: Let, $0 \preceq \Pi_{BA'} \preceq \mathrm{I}$ be such that

$$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{ASA'})\|\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'}\right) := -\log \mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi_{BA'}\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'}\right].$$

Using this, we define for each $j \in [1 : 2^{R_1+r}]$,

$$\Lambda(j) := \mathrm{I}_{A'_1}\otimes\mathrm{I}_{A'_2}\otimes\cdots\Pi_{BA'_j}\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathrm{I}_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}.$$

For $j \in [1 : 2^{R_1+r}]$, define the operator

$$\Omega(j) := \left(\sum_{j'\in[1:2^{R_1+r}]}\Lambda(j')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Lambda(j)\left(\sum_{j'\in[1:2^{R_!+r}]}\Lambda(j')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is easy to observe that $\sum_j \Omega(j) = \mathrm{I}$, and hence it forms a valid POVM. Bob applies the POVM $\{\Omega(j)\}_j$. Upon obtaining the outcome j, he outputs the block number corresponding to j.

Probability of error: Let M be the message which was transmitted by Alice using the strategy above and let M' be the decoded message by Bob using the above mentioned decoding POVMs. Notice that by the symmetry of the encoding and decoding strategy, it is enough to show that $\Pr\{M' \neq 1 \mid M = 1\} \leq (5\varepsilon + 2\delta)^2$, under the event that $M = 1$ is the transmitted message. We begin with the following calculation.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\notin\mathcal{B}(1)}\Omega(k')\right)\Theta_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{a}{=}\frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(1)}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\notin\mathcal{B}(1)}\Omega(k')\right)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_k}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_1}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{k-1}}\otimes\psi_{A'_{k+1}}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right]\\
&\leq\frac{1}{2^r}\sum_{k\in\mathcal{B}(1)}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\neq k}\Omega(k')\right)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_k}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_1}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{k-1}}\otimes\psi_{A'_{k+1}}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{b}{=}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\neq 1}\Omega(k')\right)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_1}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_2}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{c}{\leq} 2\mathrm{Tr}\left[(\mathrm{I}-\Lambda(1))\,\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_1}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_2}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right]\\
&\quad+4\sum_{k'\neq 1}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Lambda(m)\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}\left(\psi_{ASA'_1}\right)\otimes\psi_{A'_2}\ldots\otimes\psi_{A'_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right]\\
&\overset{d}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2+4\times 2^{R_1+r-\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{ASA'})\|\mathcal{N}_{AS\to B}(\psi_{AS})\otimes\psi_{A'})}\\
&\overset{e}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2+4\delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Above a follows from the definition of $\Theta_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^R}}$; b follows from the symmetry of the code construction; c follows from Hayashi-Nagaoka operator inequality (Fact 10); d follows from the definition of $\Lambda(m)$ and from the definition of $\Pi_{BA'}$ and e follows from the choice of $R_1 + r$. Now, notice that

$$\Pr\{M' \neq 1|M = 1\} \leq \mathrm{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k'\notin\mathcal{B}(1)}\Omega(k')\right)\hat{\Theta}_{A'_1,B_1\cdots,B_{2^{R_1+r}}}\right].$$

Thus, using Fact 5 and Equation 9 we have that

$$\Pr\{M' \neq 1 | M = 1\} \leq (\sqrt{2\varepsilon^2 + 4\delta^2} + 3\varepsilon + \delta)^2 \leq (5\varepsilon + 2\delta)^2.$$

This completes the proof. □

6 Quantum broadcast channel



Figure 7: Quantum broadcast channel

Description of task:

Alice wishes to communicate message pair (m_1, m_2) simultaneously to Bob and Charlie over a quantum broadcast channel, where m_1 is intended for Bob and m_2 is intended for Charlie, such that both Bob and Charlie output the correct message with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon^2$. Please refer to Figure 7.

Definition 6. *Let $|\theta\rangle_{E_{A_1}E_B}$ and $|\theta\rangle_{E_{A_2}E_C}$ be the shared entanglement between* Alice *and* Bob *and* Alice *and* Charlie *respectively. An (R_1, R_2, ε) entanglement assisted code for the quantum broadcast channel $\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}$ consists of*

- *An encoding operation $\mathcal{E} : M_1 M_2 E_{A_1} E_{A_2} \to F$ for* Alice .
- *A pair of decoding operations $(\mathcal{D}_B, \mathcal{D}_C)$, $\mathcal{D}_B : BE_B \to M_1'$ and $\mathcal{D}_C : CE_C \to M_2'$, with $(M_1', M_2') \equiv (M_1, M_2)$ being the output registers, such that for all (m_1, m_2)*

$$\Pr((M_1', M_2') \neq (m_1, m_2) | (M_1, M_2) = (m_1, m_2)) \leq \varepsilon^2$$

One-shot Marton inner bound

Our achievability protocol is inspired by the work[13].

Theorem 5. *Fix $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$. Let $\mathcal{N} : F \to BC$ be a quantum broadcast channel and let $\psi_{FA_1A_2}$ be a quantum state. Then for any R_1, R_2 satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1}) \| \mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_1}) - 5 \log \frac{1}{\delta} - 2, \\ R_2 &\leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_B \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_2}) \| \mathrm{Tr}_B \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_2}) - 5 \log \frac{1}{\delta} - 2, \\ R_1 + R_2 &\leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1}) \| \mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_1}) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_B \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_2}) \| \mathrm{Tr}_B \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_2}) \\ &\quad - \bar{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon,\delta}(A_1 : A_2)_\psi - 11 \log \frac{1}{\delta} - 5, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

the tuple $(R_1, R_2, 4\varepsilon + 9\sqrt{\delta})$ is achievable.



Figure 8: Schematic for the achievability proof of quantum broadcast channel.

Proof. Given R_1, R_2 as in the statement of the theorem, choose r_1, r_2 such that

$$r_1 + r_2 = \lceil \bar{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\varepsilon,\delta}(A_1 : A_2)_\psi + 3 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \rceil, \quad r_1, r_2 \geq \log \frac{1}{\delta},$$

$$R_1 + r_1 \leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1}) \| \mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_1}) - 4\log\frac{1}{\delta} - 1$$

and

$$R_2 + r_2 \leq \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1}) \| \mathrm{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_1}) - 4\log\frac{1}{\delta} - 1.$$

The existence of such r_1, r_2 follows from [13].

Let A_1' be a register such that $|\psi\rangle_{A_1'A_1}$ is a purification of ψ_{A_1}. Introduce the registers

$$A'^{(1)}, A'^{(2)}, \ldots A'^{(2^{R_1+r_1})}$$

such that $A'^{(i)} \equiv A_1'$ and $A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \ldots A^{(2^{R_1+r_1})}$ such that $A^{(i)} \equiv A_1$. Alice and Bob share the state

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A'^{(1)}A^{(1)}} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A'^{(2)}A^{(2)}}, \ldots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A'^{(2^{R_1+r_1})}A^{(2^{R_1+r_1})}},$$

where Alice holds the registers $A'^{(1)}, A'^{(2)}, \cdots, A'^{(2^{R_1+r_1})}$ and Bob holds the registers $A^{(1)}, A^{(2)}, \cdots, A^{(2^{R_1+r_1})}$. We divide these copies of shared entanglement into blocks, each of size 2^{r_1}, where the block $\mathcal{B}(j)$ involves the registers $A'^{((j-1)\cdot 2^{r_1}+1)}A^{((j-1)\cdot 2^{r_1}+1)}, \ldots A'^{(j\cdot 2^{r_1})}A^{(j\cdot 2^{r_1})}$. For brevity, we set $st(j) = (j-1)\cdot 2^{r_1} + 1, en(j) = j \cdot 2^{r_1}$.

Similarly, let A_2' be a register such that $|\psi\rangle_{A_2'A_2}$ is a purification of ψ_{A_2}. Introduce the registers $\hat{A}'^{(1)}, \hat{A}'^{(2)}, \ldots \hat{A}'^{(2^{R_2+r_2})}$, such that $\hat{A}'^{(i)} \equiv A_2'$ and $\hat{A}^{(1)}, \hat{A}^{(2)}, \ldots \hat{A}^{(2^{R_2+r_2})}$ such that $\hat{A}^{(i)} \equiv A_2$. Alice and Charlie share the state

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{\hat{A}'^{(1)}\hat{A}^{(1)}} \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{\hat{A}'^{(2)}\hat{A}^{(2)}}, \ldots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{\hat{A}'^{(2^{R_2+r_2})}\hat{A}^{(2^{R_2+r_2})}},$$

where Alice holds the registers $\hat{A}'^1, \hat{A}'^2, \cdots, \hat{A}'^{2^{R_2+r_2}}$ and Charlie holds the registers $\hat{A}^1, \hat{A}^2, \cdots, \hat{A}^{2^{R_2+r_2}}$.

We divide these copies of shared entanglement into blocks, each of size 2^{r_2}, where the block $\mathcal{C}(j)$ involves the registers $\hat{A}'^{((j-1)\cdot 2^{r_2}+1)}\hat{A}^{(j-1)\cdot 2^{r_2}+1}, \ldots \hat{A}'^{(j\cdot 2^{r_2})}\hat{A}^{(j\cdot 2^{r_2})}$. For brevity, we set $\tilde{st}(j) = (j-1)\cdot 2^{r_2} + 1, \tilde{en}(j) = j \cdot 2^{r_2}$.

For the block pair $(\mathcal{B}(i), \mathcal{C}(j))$, where $(i,j) \in [1:2^{R_1}] \times [1:2^{R_2}]$, define the following state:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau^{(i,j)}_{A^{st(i)}\ldots A^{en(i)}\hat{A}^{\tilde{st}(j)}\ldots\hat{A}^{\tilde{en}(j)}} \\
&\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{r_1+r_2}} \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{B}(i)\times\mathcal{C}(j)} \psi_{A^{k_1}\hat{A}^{k_2}} \otimes \psi_{A^{st(i)}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1-1}} \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1+1}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{en(i)}} \otimes \\
&\qquad\qquad \psi_{\hat{A}^{st(j)}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{k_2-1}} \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{k_2+1}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{\tilde{en}(j)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Introduce a register G such that $|\Psi\rangle_{GFA_1A_2}$ is a purification of $\psi_{FA_1A_2}$. Consider the following purification of $\tau^{(i,j)}_{A^{st(i)}\ldots A^{en(i)}\hat{A}^{\tilde{st}(j)}\ldots\hat{A}^{\tilde{en}(j)}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\tau^{(i,j)}\rangle_{KGFA'^{st(i)}\ldots A'^{en(i)}\hat{A}'^{\tilde{st}(j)}\ldots\hat{A}'^{\tilde{en}(j)}A^{st(i)}\ldots A^{en(i)}\hat{A}^{\tilde{st}(j)}\ldots\hat{A}^{\tilde{en}(j)}} \\
&\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{(r_1+r_2)/2}} \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{B}(i)\times\mathcal{C}(j)} |(k_1,k_2)\rangle_K |\Psi\rangle_{GFA^{k_1}\hat{A}^{k_2}} \otimes \\
&|\psi\rangle_{A'^{st(i)}A^{st(i)}} \ldots \otimes |\psi\rangle_{A'^{k_1-1}A^{k_1-1}} \otimes |0\rangle_{A'^{k_1}} \otimes |\psi\rangle_{A'^{k_1+1}A^{k_1+1}} \ldots \otimes |\psi\rangle_{A'^{en(i)}A^{en(i)}} \otimes \\
&|\psi\rangle_{\hat{A}'^{\tilde{st}(i)}\hat{A}^{\tilde{st}(i)}} \ldots \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\hat{A}'^{k_2-1}\hat{A}^{k_2-1}} \otimes |0\rangle_{\hat{A}'^{k_2}} \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\hat{A}'^{k_2+1}\hat{A}^{k_2+1}} \ldots \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\hat{A}'^{en(j)}\hat{A}^{en(j)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 2, and the choice of r_1, r_2, it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\tau^{(i,j)}_{A^{st(i)}\ldots A^{en(i)}\hat{A}^{\tilde{st}(j)}\ldots\hat{A}^{\tilde{en}(j)}}, \psi_{A^{st(i)}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{en(i)}} \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{\tilde{st}(i)}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{\tilde{en}(i)}}) \leq \varepsilon + 3\sqrt{\delta}.$$

Thus, there exists an isometry

$$U^{(i,j)} : A'^{st(i)} \ldots A'^{en(i)}\hat{A}'^{\tilde{st}(j)} \ldots \hat{A}'^{\tilde{en}(j)} \to KGFA'^{st(i)} \ldots A'^{en(i)}\hat{A}'^{\tilde{st}(j)} \ldots \hat{A}'^{\tilde{en}(j)}$$

such that (by Uhlmann's Theorem)

$$\mathrm{P}\Bigg(U|\tau^{(i,j)}\rangle\langle\tau^{(i,j)}|U^\dagger, |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A'^{st(i)}A^{st(i)}} \otimes \ldots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{A'^{en(i)}A^{en(i)}} \\ \otimes|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{\hat{A}'^{\tilde{s}t(j)}\hat{A}^{\tilde{s}t(j)}} \otimes \ldots |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{\hat{A}'^{e\tilde{n}(j)}\hat{A}^{e\tilde{n}(j)}}\Bigg) \leq \varepsilon + 3\sqrt{\delta}. \tag{11}$$

Our protocol is as follows. Please refer to Figure 8.

Encoding: Alice on receiving the message $m_1, m_2 \in [1 : 2^{R_1}] \times [1 : 2^{R_2}]$ considers the block pair $(\mathcal{B}(m_1), \mathcal{C}(m_2))$. She applies the isometry U^{m_1,m_2} on registers $A'^{st(i)} \ldots A'^{en(i)}\hat{A}'^{\tilde{s}t(j)} \ldots \hat{A}'^{e\tilde{n}(j)}$. Then she sends the register F through the channel.

Let the joint state in Bob and Charlie's possession after this transmission over the channel be $\hat{\Theta}_{BCA^1\ldots A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}\hat{A}^1\ldots\hat{A}^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}$. Define the state

$$\Theta_{BCA^1\ldots A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}\hat{A}^1\ldots\hat{A}^{2^{R_1+r_1}}} \\ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2^{r_1+r_2}} \sum_{(k_1,k_2)\in\mathcal{B}(m_1)\times\mathcal{C}(m_2)} \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA^{k_1}\hat{A}^{k_2}}) \otimes \psi_{A^1} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1-1}} \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1+1}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}} \otimes \\ \psi_{\hat{A}^1} \ldots \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{k_2-1}} \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{k_2+1}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{\hat{A}^{2^{R_2+r_2}}}.$$

From Equation 11, and monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations, it holds that

$$\mathrm{P}(\Theta_{BCA^1\ldots A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}\hat{A}^1\ldots\hat{A}^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}, \hat{\Theta}_{BCA^1\ldots A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}\hat{A}^1\ldots\hat{A}^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}) \leq \varepsilon + 3\sqrt{\delta}. \tag{12}$$

Decoding: Let, $0 \preceq \Pi_{BA_1} \preceq \mathrm{I}$ be such that

$$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1})\|\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_1}) \\ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\log\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi_{BA_1}\mathrm{Tr}_C\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_1}\right].$$

Let, $0 \preceq \Pi_{CA_2} \preceq \mathrm{I}$ be such that

$$\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_2})\|\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_2}) \\ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\log\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi_{CA_2}\mathrm{Tr}_B\mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F)\otimes\psi_{A_2}\right].$$

We begin to define the decoding POVM for Bob . For each $j \in [1 : 2^{R_1+r_1}]$, define

$$\Lambda(j) := \mathrm{I}_{A'^1} \otimes \mathrm{I}_{A'^2} \otimes \cdots \Pi_{BA'^j} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{I}_{A'^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}.$$

For $j \in [1 : 2^{R_1+r_1}]$, define the operator

$$\Omega(j) := \left(\sum_{j'\in[1:2^{R_1+r_1}]}\Lambda(j')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Lambda(j)\left(\sum_{j'\in[1:2^{R_1+r_1}]}\Lambda(j')\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

It is easy to observe that $\sum_j \Omega(j) = \mathrm{I}$, and hence it forms a valid POVM. Bob applies the POVM $\{\Omega(j)\}_j$. Upon obtaining the outcome j, he outputs the block number corresponding to j. Charlie's decoding POVM is constructed similarly using the projector Π_{CA_2}.

Probability of error: Let (M_1, M_2) be the message pair which was transmitted by Alice using the strategy above and let (M_1', M_2') be the decoded message by Bob and Charlie using the above

mentioned decoding POVMs. Notice that by the symmetry of the encoding and decoding strategy, it is enough to show that

$$\Pr\left\{(M_1', M_2') \neq (1,1) \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\} \leq (4\varepsilon + 9\sqrt{\delta})^2,$$

under the event that $(M_1, M_2) = (1,1)$ is the transmitted message pair. We upper bound this probability as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left\{(M_1', M_2') \neq (1,1) \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\} \\
&\leq \Pr\left\{M_1' \neq 1 \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\} + \Pr\left\{M_2' \neq 1 \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now upper bound $\Pr\left\{M_1' \neq 1 \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\}$. Before calculating this error with respect to $\hat{\Theta}$, we will calculate this error with respect to the state Θ, as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k' \notin \mathcal{B}(1)} \Omega(k')\right) \Theta_{BA^1\cdots A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right] \\
&\overset{a}{=} \frac{1}{2^{r_1}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}(1)} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k' \notin \mathcal{B}(1)} \Omega(k')\right) \operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA^k}) \otimes \psi_{A^1} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1-1}} \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1+1}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2^{r_1}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{B}(1)} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k' \neq k} \Omega(k')\right) \operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA^k}) \otimes \psi_{A^1} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1-1}} \otimes \psi_{A^{k_1+1}} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right] \\
&\overset{b}{=} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k' \neq 1} \Omega(k')\right) \operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA^1}) \otimes \psi_{A^2} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right] \\
&\overset{c}{\leq} 2\operatorname{Tr}\left[(\mathrm{I} - \Lambda(1)) \operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA^1}) \otimes \psi_{A^2} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right] \\
&\quad + 4 \sum_{k' \neq 1} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\Lambda(m) \operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA^1}) \otimes \psi_{A^2} \ldots \otimes \psi_{A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right] \\
&\overset{d}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2 + 4 \times 2^{R_1+r_1 - \mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{H}}^{\varepsilon}\left(\operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_{FA_1}) \middle\| \operatorname{Tr}_C \mathcal{N}_{F\to BC}(\psi_F) \otimes \psi_{A_1}\right)} \\
&\overset{e}{\leq} 2\varepsilon^2 + 8\delta^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Above a follows from the definition of $\Theta_{A_1', B_1 \cdots, B_{2^R}}$; b follows from the symmetry of the code construction; c follows from Hayashi-Nagaoka operator inequality (Fact 10); d follows from the definition of $\Lambda(m)$ and from the definition of $\Pi_{BA'}$; and e follows from the choice of $R_1 + r_1$. Now, notice that

$$\Pr\left\{M_1' \neq 1 \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\} \leq \operatorname{Tr}\left[\left(\sum_{k' \notin \mathcal{B}(1)} \Omega(k')\right) \hat{\Theta}_{BA^1\cdots A^{2^{R_1+r_1}}}\right].$$

Thus, using Fact 5 and Equation 12, we have that

$$\Pr\left\{M_1' \neq 1 \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\} \leq (2\varepsilon + 6\sqrt{\delta} + \sqrt{2\varepsilon^2 + 8\delta^4})^2 \leq (4\varepsilon + 9\sqrt{\delta})^2.$$

The calculation for $\Pr\left\{M_2' \neq 1 \mid (M_1, M_2) = (1,1)\right\}$ follows in the similar fashion. This completes the proof. □

7 Asymptotic limit of our bounds

An important property of smooth information theoretic quantities is that in asymptotic setting, they converge to relative entropy based quantities.

The achievability bound for point to point channel uses hypothesis testing relative entropy. Following fact exhibits its asymptotic behaviour.

Fact 12 ([28, 40])**.** *Let $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and n be an integer. Let $\rho^{\otimes n}, \sigma^{\otimes n}$ be quantum states. Define $V(\rho\|\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}(\rho(\log\rho - \log\sigma)^2) - (\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma))^2$ and $\Phi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dx$. It holds that*

$$\mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}\left(\rho^{\otimes n}\middle\|\sigma^{\otimes n}\right) = n\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) + \sqrt{nV(\rho\|\sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n),$$

and

$$\mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\rho^{\otimes n}\middle\|\sigma^{\otimes n}\right) = n\mathrm{D}(\rho\|\sigma) + \sqrt{nV(\rho\|\sigma)}\Phi^{-1}(\varepsilon) + O(\log n).$$

To exhibit the asymptotic behaviour for quantum channel with side information and rate limited quantum channel with side information (which use an alternative definition of smooth max-information), we shall require the following fact.

Fact 13. *Let $\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{D}(A^n B^n)$ be a quantum state. It holds that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{I}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho^{\otimes n}} = \mathrm{I}(A:B)_{\rho}$$

Proof. The proof follows from Corollary B.22 ([38]) and Theorem 3 in [41]. □

Now, the following lemma can be used to show that the quantity $\tilde{\mathrm{I}}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho}$ approaches $\mathrm{I}(A:B)_{\rho}$ in asymptotic and i.i.d setting.

Lemma 3. *For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ and $\sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, it holds that*

$$\tilde{\mathrm{I}}^{2\varepsilon}_{\max}(A:B)_{\rho} \leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_A \otimes \rho_B) + \log\frac{3}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Proof. The proof is given in Appendix A. □

Finally, we show that the restricted smooth max-information that we have introduced also converges properly. It is crucial in our achievability bound for quantum broadcast channel. We start with the following fact.

Fact 14 (Lemma 12 and Proposition 13,[28])**.** *For quantum state $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(A)$ and reals $0 < \delta < 1 - \varepsilon^2$, it holds that*

$$\mathrm{D}_s^{1-\varepsilon^2-\delta}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) - 2\log\frac{1}{\delta} - 2 \leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) \leq \mathrm{D}_s^{1-\varepsilon^2+\delta}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) + \log v(\sigma) + 2\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log\frac{1}{\delta},$$

where $v(\sigma_A)$ is the number of distinct eigenvectors of σ_A. It also holds that

$$\tilde{\mathrm{D}}_s^{\varepsilon^2+\delta}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A) - 2\log\frac{1}{\delta} - 2 \leq \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A)\,.$$

Proof. The first part is essentially that given in [28] (Proposition 13 and Lemma 12). For the second part, we note that the proof in [28] (Proposition 12, Equation 23) directly proceeds for this case as well: setting $R \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\rho_A\|\sigma_A)$, it is shown that for any $\delta' > 0$, it holds that $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_A\{\rho_A - 2^{R+\delta'}\sigma_A\}_-) \geq (\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2} - 2^{-\delta'/2})^2$. Setting $\delta' = \log\frac{1}{\delta}$ proves the inequality. □

We shall also need the well known Chernoff bounds.

Fact 15 (Chernoff bounds)**.** *Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be independent random variables, with each $X_i \in [0,1]$ always. Let $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ and $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}X = \mathbb{E}X_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{E}X_n$. Then for any $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$,*

$$\Pr(X \geq (1+\varepsilon)\mu) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{3}\mu\right)$$
$$\Pr(X \leq (1-\varepsilon)\mu) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2}\mu\right).$$

Now we proceed to the main results of this section. Using these results and Fact 12, we can easily conclude that for any $\varepsilon < 1/2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \bar{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon},\varepsilon/2}(A^n : B^n)_\rho = \mathrm{I}(A:B)_\rho .$$

Theorem 6. *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ be a quantum state. Fix an integer $n > 1$ and $\varepsilon < 1/2$ such that:*

$$n > 10^5 \cdot \max\{\frac{\log(1/\lambda_{min}(\rho_A))}{S(\rho_A)\cdot\varepsilon^3}, \frac{\log(1/\lambda_{min}(\rho_B))}{S(\rho_B)\cdot\varepsilon^3}\}.$$

Then it holds that

$$\bar{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon},\varepsilon/2}(A^{\otimes n} : B^{\otimes n})_{\rho^{\otimes n}} \geq \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\left(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n} \middle\| \rho_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_B^{\otimes n}\right)$$

and

$$\bar{\mathrm{I}}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon},\varepsilon/2}(A^{\otimes n} : B^{\otimes n})_{\rho^{\otimes n}} \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}/24}\left(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes n} \middle\| \rho_A^{\otimes n} \otimes \rho_B^{\otimes n}\right) + 9\log\frac{1}{\varepsilon} + (2|A| + 2|B|)\log n + 90.$$

Proof. The first inequality in the statement is trivial. So we consider the second inequality. In below, we will set $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{576}$. Our proof is divided into three main steps, as we elucidate below.

Typical projection onto subsystems A, B: For brevity, we set $\rho_{A^nB^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho_{AB}^{\otimes n}$. Let Π_{A^n} be the projector onto the eigenvectors of ρ_{A^n} with eigenvalues in the range $[(1-\delta)2^{-n\cdot S(\rho_A)}, (1+\delta)2^{-n\cdot S(\rho_A)}]$. Similarly, let Π_{B^n} be the projector onto the eigenvectors of ρ_{B^n} with eigenvalues in the range $[(1-\delta)2^{-n\cdot S(\rho_B)}, (1+\delta)2^{-n\cdot S(\rho_B)}]$. Let μ_{A^n}, μ_{B^n} be uniform distributions in the support of Π_{A^n} and Π_{B^n} respectively. Following relations are easy to observe.

$$\begin{aligned}(1-\delta)\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \leq \mu_{A^n} \leq (1+\delta)\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \leq (1+\delta)\rho_{A^n}\\ (1-\delta)\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n} \leq \mu_{B^n} \leq (1+\delta)\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n} \leq (1+\delta)\rho_{B^n}\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Using Chernoff bounds (Fact 15), we have that $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}) \geq 1 - 2\cdot\exp(-\frac{\delta^2\cdot n\cdot S(\rho_A)}{\log(1/\lambda_{min}(\rho_A))}) \geq 1-\delta$ for the choice of n. Similarly, $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}) \geq 1-\delta$.

Now, define the state $\rho'_{A^nB^n} = \frac{(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})}{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))}$. We will establish the following claims about $\rho'_{A^nB^n}$

Claim 2. *It holds that*

1. $\mathrm{F}^2(\rho'_{A^nB^n}, \rho_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1 - 16\delta$.
2. $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})) \geq 1 - 10\delta$.
3. $\rho'_{A^nB^n} \in \mathrm{supp}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})$.
4. $\rho'_{A^n} \leq \frac{1}{1-10\delta}\rho_{A^n}$ *and* $\rho'_{B^n} \leq \frac{1}{1-10\delta}\rho_{B^n}$.

Proof. We prove each item in a sequence below.

1. This is a straightforward application of gentle measurement lemma (Fact 9). Define the intermediate state $\tau_{A^nB^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(\mathrm{I}_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}(\mathrm{I}_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})}{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\mathrm{I}_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))}$. From gentle measurement lemma, $\mathrm{F}^2(\tau_{A^nB^n}, \rho_{A^n,B^n}) \geq \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}) \geq 1-\delta$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}) \geq 1-\delta$. Thus, from Fact 5, $\mathrm{Tr}((\Pi_{A^n}\otimes \mathrm{I}_{B^n})\tau_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1-9\delta$. Applying gentle measurement lemma again, this gives that $\mathrm{F}^2(\rho'_{A^nB^n}, \tau_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1-9\delta$. By triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1), we conclude that $\mathrm{F}^2(\rho'_{A^nB^n}, \rho_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1-16\delta$.
2. As established above, $\mathrm{Tr}((\Pi_{A^n}\otimes \mathrm{I}_{B^n})\tau_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1-9\delta$. The item follows by substituting the definition of $\tau_{A^nB^n}$ and using $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}) \geq 1-\delta$.
3. This follows since $(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}) < \Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}$.
4. We proceed as follows for ρ'_{B^n}.

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho'_{B^n} &= \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))}\mathrm{Tr}_{A^n}((\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})) \\
&< \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}_{A^n}((\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})) \\
&+ \mathrm{Tr}_{A^n}(((\mathrm{I}_{A^n}-\Pi_{A^n})\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}((\mathrm{I}_{A^n}-\Pi_{A^n})\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))\Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))}(\mathrm{Tr}_{A^n}((\mathrm{I}_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})\rho_{A^nB^n}(\mathrm{I}_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))) \\
&= \frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}(\rho_{A^nB^n}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}))}\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n} < \frac{1}{1-10\delta}\rho_{B^n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Last inequality is due to item 2 above and the fact that Π_{B^n} is a projector onto certain eigenspace of ρ_{B^n}. Same argument holds for ρ'_{A^n}.

□

Switching to information spectrum relative entropy: Using above claim, we now proceed to second step of our proof. As a corollary from the Claim (Item 1), along with Fact 14, we conclude

$$\mathrm{D}_s^{1-50\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}) - 2\log\frac{1}{\delta} \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{5\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}) \quad (14)$$

To further simplify this equation, we have the following claim.

Claim 3. *For any $R > 0$, it holds that*

$$\{\rho'_{A^nB^n} - 2^R\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}\}_+ = \{\rho'_{A^nB^n} - 2^R\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}\}_+.$$

Proof. The projector Π_{A^n} commutes with ρ_{A^n} and similarly Π_{B^n} commutes with ρ_{B^n}. For a given $R > 0$, consider the operator $O \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \rho'_{A^nB^n} - 2^R\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}$ in the eigenbasis of $\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}$. Since $\rho'_{A^nB^n} \in \mathrm{supp}(\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n})$, which follows from Claim 2, there is no eigenvector of O orthogonal to the projector $\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}$. Thus, the positive eigenspace of O is equal to the positive eigenspace of $\rho'_{A^nB^n} - 2^R\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}$. This proves the claim. □

This claim implies, from the definition of information spectrum relative entropy, that

$$\mathrm{D}_s^{1-50\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n}\otimes\rho_{B^n}) = \mathrm{D}_s^{1-50\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n}\otimes\Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}).$$

Now, we proceed in the following way, setting $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v(\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \otimes \Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n})$, which is the number of distinct eigenvalues of $\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \otimes \Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{D}_s^{1-50\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \otimes \Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}) \\
&\stackrel{a}{\geq} \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{200\delta}}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \otimes \Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}) - \log v - 3\log\frac{1}{\delta} \\
&\stackrel{b}{\geq} \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{200\delta}}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}) - 2\log\frac{1}{1-\delta} - \log v - 3\log\frac{1}{\delta} \\
&\stackrel{c}{\geq} \tilde{\mathrm{D}}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}) - 2\log\frac{1}{1-\delta} - \log v - 5\log\frac{1}{\delta}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Fact 14, (b) follows from Fact 8 and Equation 13 and (c) follows from application of second part of Fact 14.

Combining this with Equation 14, we conclude that

$$\tilde{\mathrm{D}}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n} \otimes \rho_{B^n}) + 8\log\frac{1}{\delta} + \log v. \tag{15}$$

Removing large eigenvalues: Now we are in a position to proceed through the final step. Let R' be the minimum achieved in $\tilde{\mathrm{D}}_s^{400\delta}(\rho'_{A^nB^n}\|\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n})$. For brevity, set $\Pi' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho'_{A^nB^n} - 2^{R'}\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}\}_-$ and define the state $\rho''_{A^nB^n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n}\Pi'}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n})}$. It holds that $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1 - 400\delta$. We prove the following properties for $\rho''_{A^nB^n}$.

Claim 4. *It holds that*

1. $\mathrm{P}(\rho''_{A^nB^n}, \rho_{A^nB^n}) \leq 24\sqrt{\delta}$.
2. $\rho''_{A^n} < (1 + 1000\delta)\rho_{A^n}, \rho''_{B^n} < (1 + 1000\delta)\rho_{B^n}$
3. $\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho''_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n} \otimes \rho_{B^n}) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}^{\sqrt{\delta}}(\rho_{A^nB^n}\|\rho_{A^n} \otimes \rho_{B^n}) + 9\log\frac{1}{\delta} + \log v$.

Proof. We prove the items in the respective sequence.

1. From gentle measurement lemma 9, we have that $\mathrm{F}^2(\rho''_{A^nB^n}, \rho'_{A^nB^n}) \geq \mathrm{Tr}(\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1 - 400\delta$. Using Claim 2 and triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 1), we obtain that $\mathrm{P}(\rho''_{A^nB^n}, \rho_{A^nB^n}) \leq 24\sqrt{\delta}$.
2. Since $\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}$ is uniform in the support of $\rho'_{A^nB^n}$, $\rho'_{A^nB^n}$ commutes with $\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}$. This immediately implies that Π' commutes with $\rho'_{A^nB^n}$. Thus, we conclude that

$$\rho''_{A^nB^n} = \frac{\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n}\Pi'}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n})} \leq \frac{\rho'_{A^nB^n}}{\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n})} \leq \frac{\rho'_{A^nB^n}}{1-400\delta} \leq \frac{\rho'_{A^nB^n}}{1-400\delta},$$

   where the second last inequality follows from the relation $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi'\rho'_{A^nB^n}) \geq 1 - 400\delta$.
   Invoking Claim 2, we obtain

$$\rho''_{A^n} \leq \frac{\rho'_{A^n}}{1-400\delta} \leq \frac{\rho_{A^n}}{(1-400\delta)(1-10\delta)} \leq \frac{\rho_{A^n}}{1-410\delta}.$$

   Similarly, we obtain $\rho''_{B^n} \leq \frac{\rho_{B^n}}{1-410\delta}$. The item now follows since $\frac{1}{1-410\delta} < 1 + 1000\delta$ for the choice of δ.
3. By definition of Π', we have that $\Pi'\tau_{A^nB^n}\Pi' \leq 2^{R'}\Pi'\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}\Pi' \leq 2^{R'}\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}$, where last inequality holds since $\mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}$ is uniform. Thus, $\rho''_{A^nB^n} < \frac{2^{R'}}{1-410\delta} \cdot \mu_{A^n} \otimes \mu_{B^n}$.

From Equation 13, this further implies that

$$\rho''_{A^nB^n} < \frac{(1+\delta)^2 \cdot 2^{R'}}{1-410\delta} \cdot \rho_{A^n} \otimes \rho_{B^n}.$$

This proves the item after using Equation 15 to upper bound R'.

□

This claim allows us to conclude that $\rho''_{A^nB^n}$ forms a feasible solution for the optimization in $\bar{\mathrm{I}}^{24\sqrt{\delta},1000\delta}_{\max}(A^n : B^n)_\rho$.

Now the value of v, which is the number of distinct eigenvalues of $\Pi_{A^n}\rho_{A^n}\Pi_{A^n} \otimes \Pi_{B^n}\rho_{B^n}\Pi_{B^n}$, is upper bounded by the number of distinct eigenvalues of $\rho_{A^n} \otimes \rho_{B^n}$. This is at most $n^{2|A|+2|B|}$. This proves the theorem. □

Acknowledgment

We thank Mark M. Wilde and Ke Li for helpful comments on earlier version of this paper. This work is supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation, also through the Tier 3 Grant Random numbers from quantum processes MOE2012-T3-1-009.

References

[1] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, "Sending classical information via noisy quantum channels," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 56, pp. 131–138, Jul 1997.

[2] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, "Entanglement-assisted classical capacity of noisy quantum channels," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 83, pp. 3081–3084, Oct 1999.

[3] A. S. Holevo, "On entanglement assisted classical capacity," *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 43, pp. 4326–4333, Sept 2002.

[4] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, "Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse shannon theorem," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 48, pp. 2637–2655, Oct 2002.

[5] M. Hayashi and H. Nagaoka, "General formulas for capacity of classical-quantum channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 1753–1768, July 2003.

[6] F. Dupuis, "The decoupling approach to quantum information theory." PhD Thesis, Université de Montréal., http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.0664, 2010.

[7] F. Buscemi and N. Datta, "The quantum capacity of channels with arbitrarily correlated noise," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 1447–1460, 2010.

[8] Y. Polyanskiy, H. V. Poor, and S. Verdu, "Channel coding rate in the finite blocklength regime," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 2307–2359, May 2010.

[9] L. Wang and R. Renner, "One-shot classical-quantum capacity and hypothesis testing," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 108, p. 200501, May 2012.

[10] P. Sen, "Achieving the han-kobayashi inner bound for the quantum interference channel," in *2012 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, pp. 736–740, July 2012.

[11] O. Fawzi, P. Hayden, I. Savov, P. Sen, and M. M. Wilde, "Classical communication over a quantum interference channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, pp. 3670–3691, June 2012.

[12] N. Datta and M. H. Hsieh, "One-shot entanglement-assisted quantum and classical communication," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, pp. 1929–1939, March 2013.

[13] J. Radhakrishnan, P. Sen, and N. Warsi, "One-shot marton inner bound for classical-quantum broadcast channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, pp. 2836–2848, May 2016.

[14] N. Datta, M. Tomamichel, and M. M. Wilde, "On the second-order asymptotics for entanglement-assisted communication," *Quantum Information Processing*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 2569–2591, 2016.

[15] W. Matthews and S. Wehner, "Finite blocklength converse bounds for quantum channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, pp. 7317–7329, Nov 2014.

[16] S. I. Gelfand and M. S. Pinsker, "Coding for channels with random parameters," *Problem of Control and Information Theory*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 19–31, 1980.

[17] C. Heegard and A. E. Gamal, "On the capacity of computer memory with defects," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 29, pp. 731–739, Sep 1983.

[18] K. Marton, "A coding theorem for the discrete memoryless broadcast channel," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 25, pp. 306–311, May 1979.

[19] A. Anshu, V. Devabathini, and R. Jain, "Near optimal bounds on quantum communication complexity of single-shot quantum state redistribution." http://arxiv.org/abs/1410.3031, 2014.

[20] A. E. Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, *Network Information Theory*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[21] N. A. Warsi and J. P. Coon, "Coding for classical-quantum channels with rate limited side information at the encoder: An information-spectrum approach," in *2016 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2054–2058, July 2016.

[22] J. Yard, P. Hayden, and I. Devetak, "Quantum broadcast channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 57, pp. 7147–7162, Oct 2011.

[23] I. Savov and M. M. Wilde, "Classical codes for quantum broadcast channels," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 61, pp. 7017–7028, Dec 2015.

[24] R. Renner, "Security of quantum key distribution." PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich, Diss. ETH No. 16242, arXiv:quant-ph/0512258, 2005.

[25] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, "Duality between smooth min- and max-entropies," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4674 – 4681, 2010.

[26] M. Tomamichel, "A framework for non-asymptotic quantum information theory." PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich, http://arXiv,org/abs/1203.2142, 2012.

[27] N. Datta, "Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 2816–2826, 2009.

[28] M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi, "A hierarchy of information quantities for finite block length analysis of quantum tasks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, pp. 7693–7710, Nov 2013.

[29] H. Barnum, C. M. Cave, C. A. Fuch, R. Jozsa, and B. Schmacher, "Noncommuting mixed states cannot be broadcast," *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 76, no. 15, pp. 2818–2821, 1996.

[30] G. Lindblad, "Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities," *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 40, pp. 147–151, 1975.

[31] A. Uhlmann, "The "transition probability" in the state space of a *-algebra," *Rep. Math. Phys.*, vol. 9, pp. 273–279, 1976.

[32] D. Dacunha-Castelle, H. Heyer, and B. Roynette, "Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour VII," *Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag*, vol. 678, 1978.

[33] M. Fannes, "A continuity property of the entropy density for spin lattice systems," *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, vol. 31, p. 291294, 1973.

[34] A. Winter, "Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels.," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 2481–2485, 1999.

[35] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, "A new proof of the channel coding theorem via hypothesis testing in quantum information theory," in *Information Theory, 2002. Proceedings. 2002 IEEE International Symposium on*, pp. 73–, 2002.

[36] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*. New York, USA: Springer, 1996.

[37] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[38] M. Berta, M. Christandl, and R. Renner, "The Quantum Reverse Shannon Theorem based on one-shot information theory," *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 306, no. 3, pp. 579–615, 2011.

[39] M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi, "A hierarchy of information quantities for finite block length analysis of quantum tasks," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, pp. 7693–7710, Nov 2013.

[40] K. Li, "Second-order asymptotics for quantum hypothesis testing," *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 42, pp. 171–189, 02 2014.

[41] N. Ciganovi, N. J. Beaudry, and R. Renner, "Smooth max-information as one-shot generalization for mutual information," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, pp. 1573–1581, 2014.

A Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. The proof follows closely from [41]. We partially reproduce it here for completeness. We begin with the following claim.

Claim 5. *For quantum states $\sigma_A, \sigma_B, \psi_{AB}$, there exists a state $\bar{\psi}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\psi_{AB})$, such that*

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}\big(\bar{\psi}_{AB}\big\|\bar{\psi}_A \otimes \sigma_B\big) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\psi_{AB}\|\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) + \log \frac{3}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Proof. The proof as given in [41] is as follows. Define the operator $\Gamma_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_A^{\frac{-1}{2}} \sigma_A \psi_A^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and let Π_A be the minimum rank projector such that $\mathrm{Tr}(\Pi_A \psi_A) \geq \sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}$. Then, it is shown that $\|\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{1-\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}} \leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}$.

Now, chosing ψ_{ABC} as a purification of ψ_{AB}, Π_A is used to construct a projector Π_{BC}, which is then used to define the operator $\psi'_{ABC} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_{BC} \psi_{ABC} \Pi_{BC}$. It is shown that $\psi'_{ABC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\psi_{ABC})$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\psi'_{AB}\|\psi_A \otimes \sigma_B)} &= \|\psi_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \psi'_{AB} \psi_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2}\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2^{\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\psi_{AB}\|\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)} \|\Pi_A \Gamma_A \Pi_A\|_\infty \leq 2^{\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\psi_{AB}\|\sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)} \cdot \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now defining the operator $\psi''_{AB} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi'_{AB} + (\psi_A - \psi'_A) \otimes \sigma_B$, which satisfies $\psi''_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\psi_{AB})$, one computes

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\psi''_{AB} \| \psi''_A \otimes \sigma_B)} &= \| \psi''^{-1/2}_A \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \psi''_{AB} \psi''^{-1/2}_A \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \|_\infty \\ &= \| \psi_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \psi''_{AB} \psi_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \|_\infty \\ &\leq \| \psi_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \psi'_{AB} \psi_A^{-1/2} \otimes \sigma_B^{-1/2} \|_\infty + 1 \\ &\leq 2^{\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\psi_{AB} \| \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B)} \cdot \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\frac{\psi''_{AB}}{\mathrm{Tr}(\psi''_{AB})}$ as the desired state, the claim follows. □

Using this claim, we proceed as follows. Let $\rho'_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$ be the quantum state that achieves the minimum in the definition of $\mathrm{D}^{\varepsilon}_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| \sigma_A \otimes \rho_B)$. Using Claim 5, there exists a state $\rho''_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\rho'_{AB}) \in \mathcal{B}^{2\varepsilon}(\rho_{AB})$ such that

$$\mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho''_{AB} \| \rho''_A \otimes \rho_B) \leq \mathrm{D}_{\max}(\rho'_{AB} \| \sigma_A \otimes \rho_B) + \log \frac{3}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

This proves the lemma. □